REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled.

In the Office Action of December 15, 2009, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are amended.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yamada* et al. (US 7,102,282). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 recite a resonator structure comprising a first electrode on a driving substrate, an electron hole transport layer on the first driving substrate, a light emitting layer on the electron hole transport layer, an electron transport layer on the light emitting layer, and a second electrode on the electron transport layer.

This is clearly unlike *Yamada* which fails to disclose or even suggest a resonator structure comprising a first electrode on a driving substrate, an electron hole transport layer on the first driving substrate, a light emitting layer on the electron hole transport layer, an electron transport layer on the light emitting layer, and a second electrode on the electron transport layer. Instead, *Yamada* discloses a resonator structure which includes a buffer layer, a hole transport layer and a light emitting layer stacked in that order. See, U.S. Pat. No. 7,102,282, Col. 6, l. 18-35;. This cannot be fairly viewed as providing a resonator structure comprising an electron hole transport layer on a first driving substrate, a light emitting layer on the electron hole transport layer, an electron transport layer on the electron hole transport layer because *Yamada* discloses a resonator

with a different structure which doe not include an electron hole transport layer on the light emitting layer.

As the Applicant's specification teaches, by providing a resonator structure comprising a first electrode on the driving substrate, an electron hole transport layer on a first driving substrate, a light emitting layer on the electron hole transport layer, an electron transport layer on the light emitting layer, and a second electrode on the electron transport layer, the amount of light reflected can be reduced to 20% or less which improves image quality. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0156405, Para [0053]-[0056].

Therefore, because *Yamada* fails to disclose or even fairly suggest all of the features of claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 cannot stand. Because claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, they are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 2, 8 and 9.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 15, 2010_____ By: /Timothy M Nitsch/__

Timothy M. Nitsch
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000